

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 22, 2007 the Examiner noted that claims 1-17 were pending and rejected claims 1-17. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claim 18 has been added and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-18 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections and objections are traversed below.

OBJECTIONS

Claims 5 and 6 stand objected to for various informalities in the claims. The Applicants have amended the claims in conformity with comments of the Office.

Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Hearn, U.S. Patent No. 5,640,505 in view of Orshan, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152326. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

On page 3 of the Office Action, it is stated that Hearn, the abstract, col. 1, line 24 - col. 2 line, 13, col. 3, lines 23 - 45 disclose "[a] control system in a system comprising a plurality of service providers and a plurality of network providers, which control system enables any service provider to

order a product at any network provider and enables the network provider to manage information for delivering said product in a telecommunication network to the service provider, wherein the control system comprises: means arranged to register a product type order, from a service provider, at a network provider," as in claim 1.

However, Hearn does not disclose "a plurality of service providers and a plurality of network providers." The Abstract of Hearn states

A support structure for an operational telecommunications network deploys a set of individual technologies and provides a set of services to customers. The support structure is divided into a set of domains each of which provides a particular management function for the network. These domains include a domain for managing customer handling functions, a domain for managing the network, a domain for managing the individual technologies deployed in the network, a domain for managing instances of the individual services provided by the network, a domain for managing billing operations, a domain for managing the services provided by the network when grouped together to form a portfolio, and a domain for managing jobs performed by the human workforce for the network. Each domain has its own set of databases and systems for performing the required management operations and also interfaces to some of the other domains. Each domain is implemented by one or more tightly integrated computers. The interfaces between the domains are primarily message passing interfaces. [Emphasis added]

Thus, what is discussed in Hearn is a single network provider ("an operational telecommunications network") where the structure of the network provider is divided into a set of domains. Each domain within the single network provider is responsible for a particular facet of the network provider. There is no plurality

of network providers.

Further, there is no "plurality of service providers" discussed in Hearn. A service provider is defined as one who manages the customer relations, develops, markets and sells telecommunication or data communication services, bills the customers and handles customer support. It is not necessary for the service provider to own or operate an own a network. (See specification page 1, lines 16-20). A network provider is defined as one who manages, maintains and develops the network. The network provider activates telecommunication or data communication services, requested by the service provider, to the geographical addresses where the subscribers have their equipment. The network provider collects data from the network, which data is used as a basis for billing the subscribers for the delivered services. (See Specification page 1, lines 21-28). The Applicants are not reading these definitions into the claims, but use them to illustrate how the Hearn reference scope is distinct.

Further, if in Hearn the Office is asserting that some domains are service providers and other domains are network providers, then no network provider could be found, as all the domains in Hearn are required to be "tightly integrated" (see Hearn Abstract) to support an operational telecommunications network. As such, removal of a domain to fill the function of a service provider, the domain required to be tightly integrated, would destroy the operational network. Further, the claims

requires "control system enables **any service provider to order a product at any network provider** and enables the network provider to manage information for delivering said product," (emphasis added) as in claim 1. If the Office has broken the single network of Hearn into domains some representing a service provider, then any service provider could not order a product at any network provider. Any domain of Hearn cannot order a product from any other domain.

Therefore, Hearn does not disclose "[a] control system in a system comprising a plurality of service providers and a plurality of network providers, which control system enables any service provider to order a product at any network provider and enables the network provider to manage information for delivering said product in a telecommunication network to the service provider, wherein the control system comprises: means arranged to register a product type order, from a service provider, at a network provider," as in claim 1. The Office does not assert and the Applicants have not found that Orshan discloses such a feature.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Hearn does not disclose "means arranged to translate the communication protocols that the service provider is using to the communication protocols of the network technology of the network provider, which translation is based on said predetermined registered network technology information," as in claim 1 but

that Orshan does. Orshan discusses how a request first in DSL is transformed into standard network protocols and thereafter depending on its destination directed to the correct destination by means of deciding the correct route of the transmission. Orshan therefore discusses changing the protocol at exchange points in the transmission path where such transformations are normally done. It does not disclose "means arranged to translate the communication protocols that the service provider is using to the communication protocols of the network technology of the network provider, which translation is based on said predetermined registered network technology information." It would have not been obvious to combine the two references as Hearn discusses the infrastructure of a single network provider and Orshan discusses the transmission of data across a number of different protocols (i.e. different networks).

For at least the reasons stated above, the combination of Hearn and Orshan, taken separately or in combination, fails to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 9 and the claims dependent therefrom. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claim 18 is new. Support for claim 18 can be found in claims 1 and 9 and the Specification at page 11, lines 1-17. The prior art fails to render obvious "any service provider of a plurality of service providers to order a product at any network

provider of the plurality of network providers and enables a network provider of the plurality of network providers to manage information for delivering said product in a telecommunication network to a service provider of the plurality of service providers." The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the addition of claim 18.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-18 continue to be allowable. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr., Reg. No. 55,394
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/lrs